

Pamph
Social
Soc
W

PRICE ONE PENNY

SECOND EDITION.

SOCIALISM,

THE

RELIGION

OF

HUMANITY.

BY JOHN WARD.

(AN UNSKILLED LABOURER).

Man's inhumanity to man

Makes countless thousands mourn.

S.

375284
12.2.40

Published for the WANDSWORTH BRANCH OF THE SOCIAL
DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION, and the Trade Supplied, by
H. B. ROGERS, at SYDNEY HALL, 36, York Road,
Battersea.

SOCIALISM;

THE

RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

IN THESE days of revolutionary excitement, when the very basis of society is threatened with a violent upheaval, when creeds and dogmas which are hoary with antiquity are crumbling to pieces, and new sects and creeds are taking the place of the old ones, only to take root for a short time, then to follow those that have gone before; when men's minds are in a state of transition—standing as it were midway between the old order of things and the new; seeing this, then, there can be no better time than the present to lay down some new and noble idea, to which men can rivet their attention, and bend their hopes and aspirations, to which they may look for guidance for the future state of man's existence upon earth.

Men are beginning to show signs of dismay at not having arrived at the long looked for haven, that has been pointed out to them for generations past by the apostles of all creeds, but at which unhappily we have never arrived. For ages the higher and nobler passions of human nature have been expended upon the adoration of myths, instead of aiding common humanity; for if we look back to the history of our own little island and the religion which has stood as that of the nation what do we find—one of the basest forms of mockery that ever blotted the history of the human race.

How many times, I ask, has the emblem of the christian creed, namely, "Peace on Earth, goodwill towards men," been the direct instigation of the piling of mountains of human bones and the flowing of seas of blood; and this is not the only creed that has been baptised in blood, not only of its saints, but also that of its victims, for the ravages of the disciples of Mahomet I believe even put those of other creeds in the shade; and even in these enlightened days it has become an old saying that we first send the missionary to foreign countries and then

the gunboat, which past experience proves to be invariably correct. What I wish to show by this reference to all religions is this. that good though the intentions of their founders might have been, still we must clear our minds of cant, and face the facts and truth as it presents itself to us. That being so, we now see that after almost an infinite space of time we are no nearer the "Earthly Paradise" than we were two thousand years ago, which any reasonable man will admit is sufficient for it to have developed all over the entire universe, especially if you admit that it had the power of an omnipotent deity behind to have guided its course. But the truth is, that in some parts of the globe where the Mahomedan religion was the paramount creed, and where the inhabitants were in a high state of civilisation considering the period, the same things that we see working in our own empire to-day was at work in those empires of past ages, and despite their creed or their nationality worked the ruin of some of the finest states that it was possible to build up at that period of man's existence. But perhaps it will be said that the creed was the cause of the fall of the Mahomedan states. If that is used, then I must retort that it was the creed that caused Christian Rome to fall also. But that would be idle talk, therefore, in dealing with this subject forward, I shall attempt to make it quite plain, what the real cause was, in my opinion, that worked the ruin of these great empires in the past, and bids fair to demolish those of modern times.

Now when a nation is just emerging from barbarism, and the first sign of civilisation become visible, we see some kind of brotherly union existing among them, although demonstrations of enmity exist between two distinct people; but of course this does not last long, owing in a great measure to the continual attacks of other nations or tribes in search of plunder &c., consequently we find the prisoners taken in these tribal raids by the conquering party, used as slaves to till the soil, and wait upon their masters as domestics, while they go forth to conquer fresh territory, consequently you have, by the subjugation of the weaker tribes to the will of the stronger, and the increase of territory, the first sign of the formation of a future empire, and this is not imagination, for it is a fact that the first phase of all empires has been built upon human slavery. Of course, in time, and after conquest upon conquest has been won, the dominion becomes bulky and unwieldy. Nor is this the only cause that is at work in such a State as I have pictured for a drastic change. The slaves become numerous, and the hardships which they have to

undergo engenders a spirit of discontent in their ranks. About this time, another State, that has been undergoing the same process of evolution, comes in contact with this one, and a struggle takes place between the tyrants themselves, with the result that their power is diminished; and then, although the slaves are in a state of dense ignorance themselves, some one grasps the chance to use the discontent of the slaves against the now broken power of their masters; and thus they are used by another designing gang to overthrow the then existing system of tyranny and to build up another in its place. And so we go on through all the dark pages of history, which is the history of class struggles. Each system that is replaced by another is so far an advance of the principle of evolution, but I am sorry to say the law of evolution, or progress of the races, has always in past history been dammed back by superstition and custom until it required a revolution to sweep the barriers away. And it is quite possible that it will require a forcible revolution before the customs of the present system of society will allow it to give way also. I may say, that during these periods of evolution, creeds of all descriptions were in full play, and it is well to note that, like the present day, they were used by tyrants of the middle-ages—yes, and I might say of all ages—to keep down the turbulence of the lower strata of society, and to consecrate injustice.

The principle of progress which I have sketched out applies not only to the British Empire, but to all empires; and so far as I have gone, I am correct. But now to the task that I have put upon myself in the first part of this work, namely, that of showing the real causes that worked the ruin of these empires, after they had been built by human labour and ingenuity. Of course you are aware that the period up to which we have arrived in my sketch, wealth, as we understand the term, was practically non-existent; but we now have a new era in history, in which wealth appears, hence another struggle. Now if I refer to Babylon, I must do so very cautiously, because of the prophecy of some ancient as to its fall. Now by Biblical authority I find that this principle of evolution was carried out there—the gulf between master and slave was so widened, and the wealth entered so few hands, that its fall was certain, whether there had ever been a prophet or not, for it is an historical fact that at its fall ninety per cent. of its wealth had got into the hands of two per cent. of her population. That is a fact which speaks for itself as to the social condition of the people of Babylon at the time of its fall. But as with Babylon, so with a

number of these ancient States, there were three distinct causes at work within them. These may, I think, be placed under these three headings—First, “The accumulation of wealth into few hands,” therefore gross social inequalities were bound to follow; second, “Religious fanaticism”; third, “The dense ignorance of the people.” I may say that the second proposition only refers to a few States, while my first and last propositions I shall attempt to prove has reference to all States. Now if I turn to Egypt to prove my assertion I shall be told that this is no argument, as the Supreme Deity has placed his curse upon the land; and, by the heavens above, I think he has, when he allowed the English bondholders to fix themselves upon the unhappy people! (Pardon me for this digression, but this will not alter the facts of the case, from my point of view, at any rate.) Again, it is a fact that Egypt’s downfall took place at a time when ninety per cent. of the wealth was owned by three per cent. of the people. Now, I will try and be a little more fortunate in the next State that I select, one that has not been unfortunate enough to call forth the wrath of the gods.

Therefore I will take Persia for my argument, because this is the empire of a hundred and twenty provinces, and what do we find—why, that this once mightiest of empires vanished when the whole of her wealth had been grabbed by only one per cent. of her total population. So you see that if I had admitted that the prophecies of the ancients had anything to do with the fall of those two former States, then my last statement would be sufficient to prove my proposition. But for fear of these three not being sufficient, then I will give still more, the first of which will be Greece, which broke down when only one per cent. of her wealth was distributed among ninety-nine per cent. of her people. And then to close the list I must of course refer to Rome, and by so doing I shall have represented most of the great creeds in my list; therefore, I claim to have struck a very important blow at the contention of some, that the world can be saved, or mankind regenerated, by the worship of any particular myth or myths. Now, at the time of the fall of the Romish Empire two thousand nobles practically owned the whole wealth of the realm. All I can say is, that being a Christian country, why did not the moral restraint which we are told follows religion, have any effect upon the Romish nobles, who were the leading spirits of Christianity at that time? That is a question I will answer later on, because the subject directly before us is the social condition of the people. Now the point I wish to make is this, that upon the removal of ignorance depends the future of modern empires. At the fall of Rome the population were practically slaves, and in a state of dense ignorance. But it will be argued that

there were men of great learning also. True, but the men of learning were not slaves, consequently they were living upon the system, and to overturn it meant the upsetting of their own power, which could not be reasonably expected of them, seeing that they had no guiding principles upon which to proceed. In such a state of affairs is it not patent to every one that such things could not hold out long; and here is a point for Socialists. In Mangnall's Historical questions, page 78, this appears:—‘What caused the most frequent seditions among the Roman plebeians? (mark this!) The great interest paid for money lent. The laws made by the Decemviri forbade raising interest above 12 per cent.; but these laws were neglected, and the excessive usury practised at Rome caused most of the calamities which afterwards befell the empire. Here, then, is the opinion of a great student of ancient history, who certainly cannot be charged with having any sympathy with Socialism, or with Socialist advocates of the present day, he giving the facts almost as plainly as it is possible to hope for. So I must reserve comment for the present. But another point that wants proving in my sketch of the growth of empires, is the contention that they became unwieldy. I will refer again to the same authority. On page 85 he asks, “What occasioned the overthrow of the Roman power?—Its fall was owing to the luxury and corruption of the people when the empire became too extensive.” And I contend that that is just the position of the English empire to-day, which I shall prove further on in this work. Now, by historical facts, I have placed the subject before you in the plainest of language and it is almost impossible for any student of history to conceive how it was that these empires remained so long as they did, because it was impossible to expect any attempt to be made by the nobles to alter the state of affairs that existed, and worse than madness to hope for any move to be made towards reformation on the part of the slaves, because of the dense ignorance in which they were engulfed; therefore, never let it be said that the empire was overrun by savages from without, half so much as it was by the savages they had bred within their borders. It is a fact also, that religious feuds took place about this time among the Romans, which greatly shattered their strength, just at a time when a united people were required to stand against the inroads that were then being made on them by the Goths and Vandals.

I will now leave the ancient States, and pass down through the dark pages of history that intervene between the fall of Rome and the commencement of the 19th century—to the States of modern times. And of course we shall be able to make the evolutionary principle plainer, and substantiate the facts of history by facts that

we see around us at the present day. And by referring back on page 4, you will find almost a correct sketch of the early communes of England; and so we come along through continual struggles, until the first real great move is made in civilisation, by the introduction of industry, and the opening of foreign markets by conquest, exactly the same as was carried on in the old States of antiquity. Until this time it has only taken the shape of a struggle for power; but now, by the introduction of industry, it takes a new form—a struggle for power and wealth too. But wealth and luxury had not advanced sufficiently to cause any particular division between the master and the man; for even down to a very few years ago we find a kind of mutual friendship existing between the farmer and farm labourer, such that I have had stories told to me, of the common table, round which the whole of the farm employés and employer used to sit in common equality, to partake of their food, and converse with each other upon the prospects of the harvest. And it grieves any one who has the welfare of the people at heart, to see this feeling of friendship torn asunder, and society split up into classes, struggling against each other like grim death. Now Science begins to move, and show signs of animation. The inventive brain begins to develope, and then comes the introduction of machinery, causing a gulf between capital and labour. Those who by robbery had stolen the land from the people, and obtained by fraud and violence power over their unfortunate victims, set up a sham system of political liberty; while they based their industry upon a system of wage slavery, under the mask of individual liberty also. History then repeats itself by religious feuds in England, which, had it not been for the geographical position of the country would have had very disastrous effects upon her existence as a nation. As it was, it ended in the recognition of religious liberty, which is a sham, like all upper-class ideas of the name; for so long has we have an Established Church drawing ten millions a year from industry (which means from men of all opinions, whether their sanction is obtained or not), that cannot even be an approach to religious liberty in any sense of the word; but they did allow to be lawful the formation of as many different sects as chose. So not only has the tendency of the age been to cut society up into commercial and industrial classes, but has also tended towards splitting those classes up into religious factions. And here we have the cause of the restlessness of society. And where is the "Hope of the future"? Some say that we shall find it in a pamphlet written by the "pope" of the secular creed in the United States, Colonel R. G. Ingersoll. But it strikes me as being the voice of a forlorn hope

crying in the wilderness. This gentleman may have a great knowledge of theological subjects, but it is plain that he is lost in the question of Social Science, a subject that every man in these distressing times should be able to give a good reason for the faith that is in him. You may overthrow kings and priests, and still be no nearer the solution of the social problem, unless you are prepared to go still farther. Ingersoll says that they in America are now obliged to acknowledge that universal suffrage cannot clothe and feed the world. None but a fool would say it could, when we view the enormous monopolies that exist in that country, where the Radical's ideal state is already established. But because the exploded ideas of Radicalism have failed, that is no argument against the Socialisation of Capital; therefore I don't think he has succeeded in impeding the propaganda of Socialism so much as the Socialists have succeeded in scotching the secular serpent, by drawing the attention of the masses to the state of affairs in this world, instead of beating a dead horse by fighting about the existence of a world to come. Thus most opponents have some sort of a pet theory of their own to advocate against Socialism, but any remedy for the existing state of things is only conspicuous by its absence.

I have so far shown completely the utter inability of any creed—or no creed—to alter even slightly the social condition of the people. You may dethrone kings, but unless you are prepared to dethrone that hydra-headed monster Capitalism, there is no “hope for the future.” Capitalism has arrived at that stage of development in which it is impossible for us to go any farther without risking the consequences of a terrible upheaval of the lower strata of society, which might have the effect of reversing our progress, and throw us back into anarchical barbarism, only to repeat the downfall of the great States of antiquity. Capitalism has not only had the effect of upsetting all moral law, but natural law as well. Art finds no resting place in its bosom; like morality, it is swept out of sight in the struggle for gain. Characters that are hideous and unnatural are those that are chiefly cultivated, and these are mistaken for human nature, while the true characters have no chance to develop, for if they did, they are crushed out of existence by the cunning and greedy aspirants to wealth. Falsity has been made to appear under the guise of truth, immorality has taken the place of morality, and vice that of virtue, while Justice has completely taken her departure, so far as labour is concerned. The law of natural selection, as laid down by Darwin, is non-existent, because the system of Capitalism has reduced the marriage law to a question of £ s. d.

And, mark you, this law is supposed to be a sacred law as well as a natural one; but, alas! how the mighty are fallen, when laws that are hoary with antiquity are reduced to how much gold there happens to be on either side. Can there be anything more repulsive than to see among the middle-class—yea, and I don't know that it does not refer to all classes except the lowest—the deterioration of the moral character of our women. What is the theatre, what is the modern ballroom—but so many places where matrimonial candidates are placed as it were under the hammer for the highest bidder? Visit the ballroom of a middle-class assemblage, and there take a view of the pitiable attempts on the part of both men and women to make themselves look attractive by any means, no matter how degrading. The wonder is, these things having gone on unchecked for so long, that there is any sense of morality left. And what are the chief characters cultivated under such conditions? Why, Vanity; and a vain woman or man looks a very ridiculous animal indeed at the best of times. Having now dealt with the usual calling of our middle-class women—namely, financial match making and the cultivation of pride and vanity, I will proceed to deal with the calling of our modern workgirls. I will refer to a paper read by a gentleman at the Conference of the British Association, held I believe in Liverpool last year, and I find that out of the 500,000 workgirls of London, 250,000 work on an average for less than one shilling per day of from 12 to 14 hours. “Can it be true?” you say. I have never seen so much as an attempt made to contradict it. This being true, think, then, you defenders of Capitalism, of the thousands of blighted lives which such a state of things must necessarily cause; and, above all think of the murdered virtue of the rising generation of womankind—250,000 working for less than one shilling a day; little wonder that 80,000 of the flower of our English women have to walk the streets of London to gain a subsistence—yea, in this richest city of the world. I ask how would society defend itself if it were suddenly brought up on trial? That one charge would be more than sufficient to condemn our boasted civilization. How can you expect morality to exist in such a state of society, where one class have all the wealth and luxury to create lustful and vicious habits, and the other are in such hopeless poverty that they are made the helpless victims of that class. If you look at the high interest paid upon capital in Bryant & May (Limited), you will find out the secret to the whole mystery. Bryant & May (Limited), on the capital invested in that concern declared last year a $22\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. dividend, and they pay some of their female employés the enormous salary

of 9d. per day, or three farthings per hour for 12 hours, and yet there is belonging to this old and very respectable firm fourteen ministers of religion, the names of which are at anyone's disposal "What mean you that you beat my people to pieces, and grind the faces of the poor? Saith the Lord God of Hosts." (Isaiah iii. 15). These gentlemen tell the poor on Sunday to thank God that they have been placed in the position they are in, and then get 22½ per cent. out of their labour all the week. Such are the ways of the modern leaders of religion and morality in this highly civilised and religious England, miscalled ours.

Well might Mr. R. Giffen, Government Statistician, say these words—"No one can contemplate the present condition of the masses of the people without desiring something like a revolution for the better." (Essays in Finance, Vol. II. page 373). The great industries are swallowing up small ones, and the middle class are daily being forced either to combine to carry on production on a large scale so as to be able to compete with the great monopolist, or to take their place among the artisan masses, there to compete for a bare existence wage. Side by side with increased riches we also have increased poverty, because of the monopolies getting into fewer hands, and so increasing the number of wage slaves and the more there is to compete against each other the lower must their wages become. Yes, but some will say that you must not interfere in a free contract entered into between man and man. And I would say so too were it really a free contract; but where is the freedom of contract between a rich capitalist with the whole of the means of producing wealth and employing labour at his command, and a poor half-starved labourer with nothing but his labour force to sell, and forced to accept any offer of employment, no matter how unjust the remuneration may be, knowing full well that thousands of his fellow-workmen are in the same position as himself—ready to accept the chance, while to refuse the unjust offer on his part would mean death by starvation. If that is an individualist idea of freedom of contract, then all I can say is that freedom of contract is queer stuff. My idea of freedom of contract is that it can only be genuine when the parties meet on equal terms, with equal liberty to refuse without fear of the consequences. But, says the capitalist, or one of his henchmen, to overthrow the present basis of society is to strike a blow at individual liberty, and to crush individuality, also to crush the development of inventive genius. I will ask any reasonable being, how is it possible to cultivate the arts and sciences under a state of society where one class has only one object in view (namely, a race for gold), and the other neither the education, time, nor opportunity,

even if they wished, to cultivate anything except where to get the next meal? Does anyone mean to say that if Mr. Gladstone had been the son of a Cradley Heath chain maker, forced at the age of about 7 years to take his place at the forge by the side of his father, working excessively long hours, with scarcely sufficient nourishment to keep body and soul together, we should have had the statesman we have to-day? To answer Yes to such question would only mean labelling one's self as something worse than an idiot. Again, how could it be expected that the son of a miner, who at about the same age had to go down into the bowels of the earth to reclaim the raw wealth which Nature has placed there, working under the most dangerous and unhealthy conditions, and also receiving a bare subsistence wage when young, and when hard and laborious toil has bowed their backs, to die in a workhouse ward, and bury their sorrows in a pauper grave, to turn out a Professor Huxley? I do not quarrel with those who think such to be possible, because they are to be pitied rather than blamed. Then comes the most horrible thing in the shape of argument against interference with the competitive system — that it is essential for the survival of the fittest. I think if I had any interest in keeping up the present system of robbery, and called myself an individualist, I should always refrain from using that argument, because of its being in direct antagonism to present society. Darwin himself would have admitted that those who tilled the soil, raised the cattle, formed the police force to protect property at home, and supplied the sailors to man the ships to defend the shores from foreign invaders, and the artisans to build the ships as well; supplied the soldiers, the guns, and ammunition, to overthrow the despots of other countries, were the fittest and the only people that ought to survive in a properly organised system of society. But here again natural law is turned aside, and replaced by the artificial laws made by man, which practically says that it is better for the idle, luxurious, and vicious to survive, than the backbone of society, the real producers. And you will hear long, windy discourses, which the advocates of Capitalism shower upon us, to prove that human nature is heartless, and that before you can alter society you must overthrow it; which, if true, I admit would take a very long time to do. Real human nature has already been suppressed, if not overthrown, and an artificial nature put in its place by the greed of Capitalism. And why is the chief character of Capitalism greed? Because the causes are so numerous that will send even a large capitalist by accident into the depths of poverty. This cultivates a hideous love for gain, and a desire to increase his store at the expense of anybody by all the cunning devices, which

only a monster could invent. This may be taken for human nature, but it is not; it is only unnatural character, formed to suit the exigencies of the case, and developed in man by the not less unnatural calling of an "annexer of other people's property on scientific principles." John Ruskin, in his lecture on the Relation of Art to Morals, says that "we are constantly told that human nature is heartless. Do not believe it; human nature is kind and generous; but it is also narrow and blind." That is very true, and so we find that great writers do not think human nature heartless, if the advocates of Capitalism do. I suppose they measure other people's corn by their own bushel, which is very wrong on their part if they are desirous of finding out the truth.

But will the workers, who suffer by the continuance of this state of things, have nothing to say in this question, which is of life and death importance to them? Will not those who for ages have been made the hewers of wood and the drawers of water have no voice in the future of this country, whose wealth their labour has created? Yes, you "bourgeoise!" Look at the ever-increasing army of labour advancing to the rescue! Rescue of what? you say. Why, the rescue of downtrodden humanity from the vampire of Capitalism and the chains of hypocrisy! Well might you tremble at the array before you. The time has arrived when labour will strike the blow—not only for its own emancipation, but to save our civilisation from destruction! What sound has drawn this mighty army together, all bent upon the achievement of the same object? Can it be that at last the long-looked for saviour of the people has really descended from the spheres to teach a new truth or religion?

No, my friends; too long have the people trusted to the gods to deliver them from captivity. The age of reason has at last arrived, and with it a new religion, "The Religion of Socialism," which is the religion of humanity, and the Universal Brotherhood of Man. Its objects are, that the means of producing wealth, food, and comfort shall be in the hands of the State. Not a State like that which we have to-day, representing monopoly; but a State representing the whole community. That the land, which is the product of nature, and without which the human family could not exist, and to which they have a natural right, shall be held by them in common, to be worked in the interest of the whole community, instead of being worked in the interest of a few landlords, as a means whereby they may be able to exploit the toilers of over two hundred million pounds annually. Some Land Nationalisers, and an insignificant per centage of timid Socialists, argue that you must compensate the present owners of land. I for

one object to compensation entirely upon principle. I think if private ownership in land is unjust, it is unjust to compensate the land-owners, simply because they are about to lose a privilege which is an injustice; because by giving compensation you practically recognise the justice of their ownership. Socialism also says that "Capital" shall be the property of the nation. The question might then be asked, What is meant by the term "Capital?" It would be very difficult to draw a definite conclusion from the works of any political economists, because of the diversity of opinion among them; but what I mean by the term "capital" is, "Those mechanical instruments which facilitate labour in the production of wealth." I know that this definition is open to objection by a great number of Socialists, and so are nearly all definitions. Taking any definition, it is plain that capital is "a social product," and is the stored energy of past generations of labour. Capital, therefore, like the land, is a monopoly in the hands of private individuals, and so long as Capital remains in individual hands so long must there be master and slave; there can be no equality or freedom where there is not free access to the means of production, whether it be the natural product, Land, or the social product, Capital. Not only so, but the advance of machinery keeps increasing the productive power of capital, and the large monopolies are crushing out the little ones, therefore increasing the number of the proletariat, who are dependent upon those who hold the monopolies for subsistence. The natural outcome of such a system is that with increased wealth we have increased poverty; for the competition among the monopolists themselves makes it necessary for them to struggle for a higher profit on their capital, which means to the wage-slave lower wages, making it necessary on the part of the workers to strike for higher wages, which means a low profit on capital, hence the conflict between capital and labour; then the increase of machinery comes in, takes the place of the human machine, and unless the workers are prepared to work for less than a bare subsistence wage, they and their wives and families are condemned to death by starvation. And although there are thousands of unemployed workmen walking the streets of our great industrial centres, the invention of labour-saving machinery must go on, until the labourers, by sheer force of circumstances, will be obliged to take these means of producing wealth into their own hands, and work them in the interests of labour, to save themselves and their class from complete extermination.

If this be a true picture of the present state of society (and I defy contradiction), what idle nonsense to talk of the security of

the "liberty" of the individual under such arrangements ! What a delusion when we hear it sung that "Britons never shall be slaves," and all the time in one of the worst possible forms of slavery ! Poor, miserable dupes, I pity them because of their ignorance ; but I cannot pity those who have seen all this before, and yet never attempted to arouse them from their apathetic indifference, which has almost turned to despair, because of the hopes that have at certain times been held out to them by designing political tricksters, who only traded upon their ignorance to push themselves into power and position ; but as soon as success was certain, basely deserted the cause of the very people who had placed them there. The "Hope of the Future," then, not only depends upon this cause for success, but with those who are wielding it. And why is it that the workers have confidence in their power to guide it to a successful issue ? Because education has advanced with great rapidity among the workers themselves ; so much so, that they are no longer to be made the puppets of unscrupulous individuals of the upper and middle classes, but have men in their own ranks who are capable of directing their destinies. And men of calibre are often difficult to get from the opposing forces, so that they would rather trust to their own right arm. We see the enormous evil that is going on in our midst, that the very things which caused the overthrow of ancient civilization are being produced here ; the wealth concentrating into the hands of fewer individuals ; a large class of idlers living upon usury (just the same as in Rome at the time of its fall) ; a large mass of human misery and starvation existing so that another class might be allowed to live in vicious luxury ; and, that the brutalising struggle for existence, which is being carried on by the masses, is producing the barbarians in our own country, which, if some great change is not at once carried into execution, will eventually overrun our civilisation of the nineteenth century.

Seeing this, then, we say that it is far better to teach the "Religion of Humanity," and receive the obloquy and calumny of those who seem to take a pride in the fact that civilization is on the wane, than to sit idly by until the danger is upon us, and then not have time to avert the calamity. The religion of myths failed to save ancient Rome, but that does not say that the religion of man to man shall not be able to save Modern Babylon. This is the Hope of the Future ; this the object of men's attention as they break through superstition's darkness, throw down the barriers of custom, and emerge forth into the light of reason. When this is accomplished, you, who are now

struggling for right against might, you who are receiving the brunt of the battle by opposing the forces of blind oppression, advocating the cause of truth and justice as against cant and injustice, championing the claim of the defenceless, and supporting the honour and virtue of our youth—what nobler satisfaction will you require than to look upon the fruits of your labours, and know that you have done your duty to yourselves and your fellow countrymen ; St. John says there is no greater love than that a man lay down his life for his friends ! Then Art will not be expelled from her place, but will be able to once more take her place among the ennobling pursuits of human genius ; Science and Literature will go forward with leaps and bounds—science into the infinite mysteries of the universe, and literature into the studies of the great teachers of mankind. All the higher and nobler passions of human nature will have an opportunity to develop every faculty that tends to the perfection of man. And why ? Because the conditions of the people will have changed. The young will be educated in the most elementary schools ; not schools that cramp their little minds into one channel, but an education where the diversity of faculties would have a chance to develop. The social conditions will be equal when they have arrived at an age to be called upon to perform some duty to add to the general store. And by all contributing their share to the labour that has to be done, there will be plenty of time left to cultivate the arts and sciences. Some of them will be able to make great inventions in their leisure, which in this happy state of society will be a blessing to mankind ; some will have an inclination for science, and will awe the human race with the great discoveries they have made in the mysteries of nature ; some will study physic, others philosophy ; in which they will take so much delight as to carry on a kind of healthy competition to see which can obtain the greatest amount of knowledge upon his or her particular subject. Of course there are a vast number who will have no particular adaptation for the higher grades of knowledge, but follow the lower, and will fill up their spare time listening to those who have obtained a complete mastery of their subject expounding their discoveries to the public. But all will be complete harmony ; none are oppressed, they are all free and socially equal, though there is no equality of intellect. So that we may say that the cry which startled Europe some time ago of “ Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity ” is a fact, and that Socialism will have been established. When that time arrives we shall forget all other Creeds except the Religion of Humanity !

JOHN WARD,

PRINTED FOR THE WANDSWORTH BRANCH OF THE S.D.F. AT
5, GURLING'S YARD, YORK ROAD, S.W.